

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the specification at page 2 for purposes of clarification. This amendment does not introduce new matter into the application but simply serves to clarify the description of the invention.

Applicant has amended the claims to more particularly define the invention and to further distinguish the claimed subject matter over the prior art. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form as claim 5. Claim 2 has been canceled from the application without prejudice or disclaimer and as redundant. Claim 6 has been added to specify that the internal frame is integrally formed plastic as fully supported by Applicant's specification at page 4, line 20. The claims remaining in the application are claims 1 and 3-6. Applicant most respectfully submits that all of the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 USC 112 and are clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (APA) in view of Horie has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed.

In the Official Action reference is made to Figure 8 of the present application which is said to disclose a card adapter for accommodating a memory card and connecting an external device, the card adapter comprising a frame 81, 86 having an insertion slot at a front end thereof. An internal frame 81 mounted inside the frame member and having a lateral section and a rear section, a reception space being defined by the lateral section and the rear section of the internal frame together with a front edge and a lateral edge of the frame member. It is urged that the internal frame has at least one internal frame having at least one terminal fastening plate extending therefrom towards the reception space, the terminal facing plate having a plurality of terminals.

It is also urged in the Official Action that APA discloses the claimed system except that while covers seem to be shown, these are not discussed. Horie is relied

upon to disclose the cover use at 7, 7. It is concluded that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify APA to provide the cover as taught by Horie so as to protect the internal circuitry.

It is also urged that adapter 81 includes guide grooves and the entire body 81, 86 is read as an integral frame/internal frame. However, these statements are specifically traversed as they rely upon Applicant's teaching to interpret the prior art. The prior art must be interpreted without the benefit of hindsight of Applicant's disclosure for a proper obviousness rejection. In re Fritch, 23 USPQ 1780, 1784(Fed Cir. 1992) ("It is impermissible to engage in hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention, using the applicant's structure as a template and selecting elements from references to fill the gaps.).

Applicant most respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the basic requirements of a prima facie case of obviousness as set forth in the MPEP § 2143. This section states that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria first must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Section 2143.03 states that all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicant wishes to note that the Examiner may not be aware that the internal

frame of the present invention has only one side for defining a reception space together with the frame member and clearly, the admitted prior art is not the same as the presently claimed invention nor does it render the presently claimed invention obvious alone or in combination with the Horie invention.

In the present invention, the internal frame 31 is merely formed of a lateral section 32 and a rear section 34 to look like an "L" in shape in the drawing and to define a smaller reception space 38 together with a lateral edge 16 and the front edge 14 of the frame member 11 being structurally simplified, rather than a card connector being mounted into an adapter as in the prior art.

The Figure 8 of the APA is identical to the Horie reference in that a full frame member is mounted into an adapter, being completely different from the present invention in that the L-shaped frame is combined with the frame member.

In accordance with the present invention, the lateral edge and the front edge of the frame member along with the internal frame together define the reception space of the card connector for receiving a memory card, thereby simplifying the structure of combining the card connector and the adapter to facilitate the production process of the card adapter of the present invention.

As noted in Applicant's specification at page 4, the reception space 38 defined by the frame member 11 and the internal frame 31 is provided for inserting and receiving a memory card. The terminals 37 are connected with the adapting circuit board 41 to convert contact pins of the memory card, thereby accommodating different interfaces. The internal frame 31 and the frame member 11 are integrally formed once by plastic injection molding, thereby enhancing the structural stability and reducing the inaccuracy that may incur when the two components are combined to further attain preferable precision of positioning other components. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/726,596  
Amendment dated: December 10, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of: August 10, 2004

In view of the above comments and amendments to the specification and claims, favorable reconsider and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

*Richard E. Fichter*  
RICHARD E. FICHTER  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 26,382

Date: December 10, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: 703-683-0500  
Facsimile: 703-683-1080

REF/jrs  
S:\Producer\ref\BRAINWISE (Direction)\LAI 726,596\A01.wpd